

# **Interview Summary**

Application No.

09/900,946

Applicant(s)

HIRAHARA ET AL.

Examiner

James Mitchell

Art Unit

2827

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) James Mitchell.

(3)\_\_\_\_\_.

(2) David Bilodeau.

(4)\_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 27 March 2003.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: EP 0588094.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant proposed claim language to overcome the prior art and wanted clarification on how examiner interpreted the claim with respect to the prior art.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

  
Examiner's signature, if required

Items to discuss for Interview:

1) request clarification about transistor 29 in Fig. 2 of Matsuda being interposed between terminals 3,5 in a direction intersecting the top and bottom surfaces of the transistor (i.e., it appears the transistor 29 is interposed between the terminals 3,5 in a direction intersecting the side surfaces of the transistor 29.

2) proposed claim amendment if necessary:

e.g., wherein the at least one semiconductor chip and the predetermined two terminals are disposed in a same plane.